



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/654,857	09/05/2000	Marc Lamberton	FR9-1999-0061US	8194

58139 7590 03/15/2006

IBM CORP. (WSM)
c/o WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.
P.O. BOX 50784
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

ZHONG, CHAD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/654,857	LAMBERTON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chad Zhong	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

OFFICE ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments, see pages 5-6 of applicant's remarks, filed 01/05/2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-15 under 35 USC 102(e) and 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been maintained. The action has been made final.

Claim Analysis

2. The following is a list of terms which are defined within Applicant's specification as well as the Examiner's interpretation thereof.

a) *Proxy server protocol data*, the term is defined within specification pg 10, line 10, i.e. 'SOCKS', however, the Applicant does not go on to further define what is SOCKS. In a related prior art, SOCKS protocol version 5, RFC 1928, teaches sockets are part of the SOCKS protocol in the bind operation, to establish communications between client and server (pg 5-6, BIND, 3rd paragraph). Moreover, socket is defined in the Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition as "an identifier for a particular service on a particular node on a network. The socket consists of a node address and a port number, which identifies the service". For the purposes of the present examination, the examiner will interpret the Proxy server protocol data as sockets.

b) *parameters*, the term is never specifically defined within the Applicant's specification, a few examples where an attempt to define parameters are found in pg 11, lines 20-29 wherein parameters are seen as version numbers or authentication parameters. Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition teaches parameters as "value that is given to a variable, either at the beginning of an operation or before an expression is evaluated by a program", for the purposes of present examination, the examiner will interpret parameters as values/variables.

Art Unit: 2152

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9, 11-12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ganguly et al., (hereinafter Ganguly), US 2003/0212863.

5. As per claim 1, Ganguly teaches a client-server environment, a method for providing transparency in a gateway of an IP network comprising the steps of:

interrogating a directory (Fig 3, item 312; Fig 9, item 900) comprising proxy server protocol data specific to every end-user network account of said IP network (Fig 9, item 900; [0125-0126]; The data which the users are querying on servers or proxy are account specific. According to [0013], the data themselves are based on employee IDs, email, residential address, contacts, salary, and various projects; furthermore, proxy server uses predicate logic in an attempt to find out if the data is available locally in order to quickly storing and retrieving service data. Data available on the proxy is generally elaborate as it contains names of the client, company, and are accessible by IDs that are stored in non-persistent memory [0041]);

retrieving parameters (Fig 9, item 904-914) associated with a proxy server protocol data for a first end-user in response to an access request from a client application of said first end-user ([0030-0031], parameters are requests by the clients; [0040], predicates that make sense out of query; [0049]; [0126-0127], where the predicates are matched up with the values on the Backend Configuration Table of Fig. 9).

accessing an application server on behalf of said client application in accordance with said retrieved parameters for said first end-user ([0049]; [0127]).

relaying data between said client application and said application server ([0039]).

Art Unit: 2152

6. As per claim 2, Ganguly teaches the step of creating, in said gateway of said IP network, a directory including entries for every end-user on said IP network ([0014]; [0030-0031]; Fig 4, item 404; Fig 7, item 700).

7. As per claim 4, Ganguly teaches wherein the step of retrieving parameters associated with proxy server protocol data for said first end-user includes the steps of:

obtaining leading data from said client application having issued said request for said end-user ([0017], leading data is the request/query/predicate);

parsing said leading data ([0030], request analyzed to determine a predicate used to index directory cache);

determining a protocol said client application is currently using ([0005]);

interrogating said directory at an entry corresponding to said first end-user ([0039]; [0126-0127]);

retrieving parameters associated with said request ([0040]; [0049]; [0126]); and

executing said protocol in accordance with said parameters associated with said protocol ([0040-0041]; [0127]).

8. As per claims 9 and 14, claims 9 and 14 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 4 above.

9. As per claims 6 and 11, claims 6 and 11 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 1 above.

10. As per claims 7 and 12, claims 7 and 12 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 2 above.

11. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

12. Claims 3, 8, 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganguly, as applied in claims 1, 6 and 11 above, in view of Aravamudan et al. (hereinafter Aravamudan), US 6,301,609.

13. As per claim 3, Ganguly teaches the step of updating, in said gateway of said network, the directory of said end-users, said step of updating the directory including the steps of:

updating said entries of said end-users comprising dynamic parameters whenever said parameters are changing while connected (Ganguly, [0043], predicate logic table is updated as new searches is queried by the user).

Ganguly does not explicitly teach:

enabling entries for those of said end-users that connect; and

disabling entries for those of said end-users that disconnect.

However, Aravamudan teaches:

enabling entries for those of said end-users that connect (Aravamudan, Col. 2, lines 40-49); and

disabling entries for those of said end-users that disconnect (Aravamudan, Col. 8, lines 1-30

wherein system of Aravamudan discloses of a proxy chat system where the users' online status information are stored in a remote centralized repository, this is important in a chat system to maintain user's privacy and making sure the contact list has updated information.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Ganguly and Aravamudan because teaching of Aravamudan to allow user connection status would improve the interface of Ganguly by maintain the connection status of end user devices and notify said user of the current system status (Aravamudan, see for example, Col. 7, line 60 – Col. 8, line 5).

14. As per claims 8, 13, claims 8, 13 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 3 above.

Art Unit: 2152

15. Claims 5, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganguly, as applied in claims 1, 6 and 11 above, in view of Banavar et al. (hereinafter Banavar), US 6,662,206.

16. As per claim 5, Ganguly does not explicitly teach the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established.

However, Banavar teaches the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established (Banavar, Col. 2, lines 27-40; Col. 1, lines 55-67; Col. 8, lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time of invention was made to combine the teaching of Ganguly and Banavar because the teaching of Banavar to allow the step of informing said end-user of said client application that a server application is unavailable if a link to said application server is not established would improve the failure analysis for Ganguly's system by monitoring the link in a real time basis to detect any potential link failures (Banavar, Col. 2, lines 1-5).

17. As per claims 10 and 15, claims 10 and 15 are rejected for the same reason as the rejection to claim 5 above.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's remarks filed 01/05/2006 have been considered but are found not persuasive in view at the new grounds at rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendment.

19. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Ganguly fails to disclose or suggest proxy server protocol data specific to every end-user network account of said IP network.

In response to applicant's amendment, Ganguly teaches interrogating a directory (Fig 3, item 312;

Art Unit: 2152

Fig 9, item 900) comprising proxy server protocol data specific to every end-user network account of said IP network (Fig 9, item 900; [0125-0126]; The data which the users are querying on servers or proxy are account specific. According to [0013], the data themselves are based on employee IDs, email, residential address, contacts, salary, and various projects; furthermore, proxy server uses predicate logic in an attempt to find out if the data is available locally in order to quickly storing and retrieving service data. Data available on the proxy is generally elaborate as it contains names of the client, company, and are accessible by IDs that are stored in non-persistent memory [0041]);

20. In the remark, the applicant argued in substance that Ganguly fails to disclose or suggest determining a protocol said client application is currently using.

In response to applicant's arguments, the fact that Ganguly teaches the system operates on multiple protocols inherently suggest the system will determine different protocol parameters for each and every protocol. Specifically, TCP/IP protocol has different parameters than LDAP and NDS protocols, further, applicant admitted that Ganguly's system support at least two protocols, thus, Ganguly's system inherently determines the compatibility between the protocols and will support communications using multiple protocols.

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however

Art Unit: 2152

will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to

“System and method for improving gateway transparency”.

- | | | |
|-------|---|--------------------|
| i. | US 2002/0059429 | Carpenter et al. |
| ii. | US 6,529,937 | Murphy, Jr. et al. |
| iii. | US 5,740,361 | Brown. |
| iv. | US 6,058,480 | Brown. |
| v. | US 6,078,943 | Yu. |
| vi. | US 2003/0140153 | Lawrence. |
| vii. | US 6,061,692 | Thomas et al. |
| viii. | “Address Allocation for Private Internets” RFC 1597, March 1994 | |
| ix. | US 6,477,577 | Asano. |
| x. | US 5,699,350 | Kraslavsky. |
| xi. | US 5,845,255 | Mayaud. |


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAROENCHONWANIT, BUNJOB can be reached on (571)272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CZ
March 7, 2006



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER